

REMARKS

Claims 11, 12, 30, and 38-69 have been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended to include first and second sheaths. Cancelled claim 38 included a limitation of an outer sheath. Therefore, amended claim 1 is somewhat similar to original claim 38. Claims 70-99 are withdrawn.

I. Double Patenting

A rejection of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on claim 4 of US Pat. No. 7,065,394. Claim 1 has been amended to recite a guide catheter in accordance with Fig. 7 of the present application, which includes an outer sheath 60 and an inner sheath 50. Accordingly, amended claim 1 requires more than just the structure of claim 4 of the '394 patent modified as to a distal tip dimension. Accordingly, applicants submit that the basis for the double patenting rejection is obviated and the rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 3-5, and 36 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bosley, Jr. et al. (US 5,081,997).

Claim 1 has been amended to include recitation of a first sheath similar to the sheath of claim 1 of the '394 patent and an additional, second sheath. The structure set forth in amended claim 1 provides a first elongated sheath adapted to cannulate a coronary sinus and a second elongated sheath adapted to be passed through the inner channel of the first elongated sheath for cannulating

primary and secondary (and tertiary) branch veins of a vasculature. Bosley discloses nothing more than the use of echogenic materials in a medical device. Bosely fails to anticipate amended claim 1.

The anticipation rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1, 3-5, 13, 15-18, 38, 39, 46, 48-51, and 69 are rejected as being unpatentable over Li et al. (US 6,066,126) in view of Bosley, Jr. et al.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 13, 17, 19, and 20 are rejected as being unpatentable over Rickerd (US 5,322,509) in view of Bosley, Jr. et al. Claims 38, 39, 46, 50, 52, and 53 are rejected as being unpatentable over Rickerd in view of Bosley, Jr., and further in view of Sylvanowicz (US 4,935,017).

Claims 1, 4, 13, 17, 20, 21-24, 26, 28, 38, 46, 50, 54-57, 59, and 61 are rejected as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. (US 6,039,723) in view of Bosley, Jr.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, 38, and 40-44 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sarkis et al. (US 5,921,933) in view of Bosley, Jr.

Claims 1 and 30 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ju et al. (US 5,599,325) in view of Bosley, Jr.

Claims 38 and 63 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ju et al. in view of Bosley, Jr., and further in view of Sylvanowicz.

Claims 1, 4, 13, 14, 31-32, and 35 are rejected as being unpatentable over Wijayarathna et al. (US 4,563,181) in view of Durfee (US 5,203,776).

Claims 33 and 34 are rejected as being unpatentable over in view of Wijayarathna et al. in view of Durfee and Bosley, Jr., and further in view of Jensen et al. (US 5,160,396).

Claims 38, 46, 47, 64, 65, 68, and 69 are rejected as being unpatentable over in view of Wijayarathna et al. in view of Durfee and Bosley, Jr., and further in view of Sylvanowicz et al.

Claims 66 and 67 are rejected as being unpatentable over in view of Wijayarathna et al., Durfee, Bosley, Jr. and Sylvanowicz et al., and further in view of Jensen et al. (US 5,160,396).

Claims 1 and 37 are rejected as being unpatentable over Edwards (US 3,416,531) in view of Bosley, Jr.

Claims 1, 4, 13, 17, 24-27, 38, 46, 50, and 57-60 44 are rejected as being unpatentable over Lentz (US 6,022,341) in view of Bosley, Jr.

Claims 21, 28, 29, 54, 61 and 62 44 are rejected as being unpatentable over Lentz in view of Bosley, Jr., and further in view of Rickerd.

Claims 1, 4, 11, and 12 are rejected as being unpatentable over Stevens (US 3,485,234) in view of Bosley, Jr.

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 38, 40, and 45 are rejected as being unpatentable over Bosley, Jr. in view of Wang et al. (US 5,951,494).

Amended claim 1 recites a first elongated sheath adapted to cannulate a coronary sinus and having proximal end, a distal tip, and an inner channel to accommodate travel of a medical component; the first elongated sheath comprising a first material in the distal tip, wherein the first material is radio-opaque and echogenic, and a second material in a wall of the sheath, wherein the second material is a reinforcing braid formed within the sheath, wherein the braid includes a plurality of strands and at least one strand of the plurality of strands forming the reinforcing braid includes a radio-opaque material, and wherein jet-milled tungsten carbide particles are distributed within the polymeric material of the first material between approximately 70 to 75 percent by weight and have an average diameter approximately less than or equal to 500 nanometers. None of the combinations of references discloses a structure having these features and characteristics. Moreover, the limitation substantially corresponds to claim 1 of US 7,065,394, which was determined to be patentable over most of the cited references in the obviousness rejections. Even as to the rejections of cancelled claim 38, none of the combinations of references results in a structure as set forth in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, each of the obviousness rejections should be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the amendments to claim 1, each of the rejections should be withdrawn. Applicants further submit that the claims are in proper form and

condition for allowance, and request that a notice of allowance issue in due course.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

June 25, 2007
Date

/Carol F. Barry/
Carol F. Barry
Reg. No. 41,600
(763) 514-4673
Customer No. 27581